

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

RICHARD W. PETERS,)	3:15-cv-00493-RCJ-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	
)	
C/O RAYMOND, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		

Before the court is Plaintiff’s Motion for Stay of Proceedings (ECF No. 81). Plaintiff’s motion is based upon an alleged debilitating mental condition. Plaintiff’s motion does not submit any medical records to support his contention. He provides no suggestion as to how long any stay should be implemented, if granted.

Defendants oppose Plaintiff’s “motion to stay the proceedings indefinitely due to his alleged inability to litigate the case.” (ECF No. 96 at 1.) As the court noted above, Defendants argue Plaintiff has not attempted to secure his medical records through kites, grievances, etc. (*Id.* at 2.) Defendants make the observation Plaintiff has also “demonstrated his ability to litigate, including presenting legal analysis, through his motions such as the Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. 70) and presentation during oral argument before this court. (ECF No. 74.) There is not good cause to delay the proceedings indefinitely.” (*Id.* at 2, ll. 26-28.)

Plaintiff did not file a reply memorandum. He did, however, file a Motion for Enlargement of Time wherein he requests, if the court denies his motion to stay, an extension to July 15, 2018, to submit his reply to Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 101).

///

1 Plaintiff's Motion to Stay (ECF No. 81) is **DENIED**. If the motion were to be granted, the case
2 would be stayed indefinitely. As Defendants argue, this case has already been pending for over two (2)
3 years, and "Defendants are entitled to a speedy resolution of the case." (ECF No. 96 at 3.)

4 Anticipating a request by Plaintiff to obtain an extension of time, Defendants state they "...do
5 not oppose a reasonable enlargement of time to oppose the motion . . ." (*Id.* at 3.) The court therefore
6 grants Plaintiff's motion for Enlargement of Time (ECF No. 101). Plaintiff is afforded until **July 15,**
7 **2018**, to submit his opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 88), a time
8 period which is approximately sixty (60) days past the current deadline for Plaintiff to oppose
9 Defendants' motion (i.e., May 14, 2018). Barring extraordinary and unforeseen circumstances, no
10 further extensions will be granted. Any reply memorandum by Defendants shall be filed in due course
11 as provided in the Local Rules.

12 DATED: May 17, 2018.

13 

14

WILLIAM G. COBB
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28